

10 ~~36)~~ The suppository enema according to claim ~~27~~, wherein said at least one lytic enzyme is lyophilized.

11 ~~37)~~ The suppository enema according to claim ~~27~~, wherein said at least one lytic enzyme is present in a concentration of about 100 to about 100,000 active enzyme units per milliliter of fluid in the wet environment of the digestive tract

B¹
cont
12 ~~38)~~ The suppository enema according to claim ~~37~~, wherein said at least one lytic enzyme is present in a concentration of about 100 to about 10,000 active enzyme units per milliliter of fluid in the wet environment of the digestive tract.

REMARKS


Claims 15-26 have been canceled and claims 27-38 have been added.

The Office Action also stated that this patent application was rejected as being obvious over prior art. Applicant strongly disagrees.

This patent application is directed to an enzyme that is specific for a specific bacteria. Unlike those enzymes cited in the prior art the enzyme of the patent application does not destroy all bacterial flora, but only a very specific bacterial species. The biological advantage of not wiping out the "good bacteria" found in the flora, but of only invasive bacteria is tremendous. One can now treat bacterial infections of the gut without causing diarrhea. Additionally, when one wipes out all bacteria, this increases the risk of another invasive organism attacking the host. By eliminating this risk, the chances of treating a bacterial illness without harming the patient increases.

The application is now in condition for allowance. Please call the undersigned at (301) 603-9071 if you have any questions or comments. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jonathan E. Grant', written over the printed name.

Jonathan E. Grant

Reg. No. 34,830

2120 L Street, N.W., Suite 210
Washington, D.C. 20037